UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,669	04/13/2004	Se-young Jang	1572.1252	4799

21171 7590 09/27/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
DOAN, THERESA T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2814	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/822,669	Applicant(s) JANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Theresa T. Doan	Art Unit 2814	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☒ The period for reply expires *03* months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: *1-14*.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (See the attachment sheets).
12. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 08/09/06
13. ☐ Other: _____.

ADVISORY ACTION (continuation of page 1)

The request for reconsideration has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance because of the following reasons:

1. Applicant argues that the proposed combination fails to teach or suggest that severing the semiconductor wafer into the plurality of the semiconductor chips.

This argument is not persuasive because Shi clearly states at column 5, lines 20-31:

"Next, at step CC the entire solid WLCFU material coated wafer is diced (singulated) into individual chips without damaging the coated WLCFU layer to produce a diced wafer 130 ... After the individual chip is picked, aligned, and placed on a circuit board or substrate at steps EE and FF, the fluxable tacky film can hold the chip to the circuit board and maintain the alignment".

In response to applicant's assertion that the Office Action's interpretation of claim 1 is inconsistent with the Specification, It is noted that Applicant cannot read limitations only set forth in the description into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. *In re Sporck*, 386 F.2d 924, 155 USPQ 687 (CCPA 1967).

Therefore, Shi clearly teaches that the wafer is singulated or severed "into individual chips" as claimed.

2. Applicant argues that the combining between Shi and APA has not been established because according to Applicant, "Motivation cannot come from the present specification".

The examiner disagrees because the motivation for combining the references is not based on the present invention as asserted by Applicant, but rather, is based on Applicant admitted prior art (APA). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the references as suggested because it has been hold that when applicant states that something is prior art, it is taken as being available as prior art against the claims. Admitted prior art can be used in obviousness rejections. *In re Nomiya*, 184 USPQ 607, 610 (CCPA 1975). Also see M.P.E.P § 2129. Thus, if Applicant belies that the admitted prior art cannot be used for providing the motivation to combine the references, then Applicant is requested to point out where it is stated in M.P.E.P.

3. Applicant also argues that neither Shi nor Farnworth discloses the limitations of dependent claim 5 (now cited in independent claim 4).

The examiner disagrees because Shi clearly states at column 6, lines 8-9:

"WLCFU process requires that the qualified WLCFU material and tacky film must have high curing latency. That is, minimal curing takes place before solder flow..."

It is noted that "minimal curing" is a partially curing or "semisolid state". Therefore, from above statement, Shi clearly teaches that "a temperature to cure the underfill material to a semisolid state is lower than a reflow temperature of the solder balls" as claimed.

Furthermore, Farnworth also teaches a step of curing the underfill material to achieve a semisolid state (column 14, lines 42-45). Thus, it would have been obvious to have the temperature to cure the underfill material to a semisolid state is lower than a reflow temperature of the solder balls, in view of teachings of Shi, in order to prevent the solder balls from melting.

The Examiner thus regards that Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because both Shi and Farnworth teach the invention as claimed.

T.D
September 19, 2006.

Theresa Doan

Theresa Doan.